

BOUND VOLUMES for 1958, complete with table of contents and index, will be available until January 15, 1959, at the prepublication price of \$7.50. Volumes for 1955, 1956 and 1957 are also available at the regular price of \$15 each.

HUMAN EVENTS

Vol. XVI, No. 1

Wednesday, January 7, 1959

Washington, D. C.

News Section

Printed in Two Sections

MIDWEST GOP: *Holds the key to victory.....*(page 1)

ECONOMY: *Signposts to solvency.....*(page 2)

BOMBINGS: *Why a Federal law?.....*(page 3)

LABOR: *How history is rewritten*(page 4)

CLERGY: *Bishop hits appeasement move.....*(page 4)

The GOP and the Midwest: The Capital keeps firmly in mind Vice President Nixon's warning, on the morrow of the November election, that now is the time for the Republican party to prepare for 1960, when it must attempt to keep its hold on the Presidency of the United States.

Therefore, the pros in the Capital have their eyes fastened on an area of the country which has been too often neglected by commentators who speculate endlessly on the future political situations of New York and California. GOP politicians here know full well that, for various reasons, the most crucial area for them is the Midwest. Some of their reasons:

(1) The Midwest is historically a conservative Republican stronghold. Yet, in November, 1958, much of it turned up in the Democratic column. Republicans lost in Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Michigan, Minnesota, Nebraska, Ohio, Wisconsin and even Kansas. When all the votes had been counted in these states, the Democrats had retained or captured five Senators, seven Governors and 22 Representatives.

One of the few survivals was Senator Roman L. Hruska of Nebraska, a staunch conservative, who was re-elected to the Senate while a Democratic former school superintendent won the Governorship of the state.

(2) The situation in this area will be crucial because, of the eleven GOP Senators up for election throughout the Nation in 1960, six of them come from the Midwest or the Mountain States. They are: Carl T. Curtis of Nebraska, Thomas E. Martin of Iowa, Karl E. Mundt of South Dakota, Andrew F. Schoeppel of Kansas, Gordon L. Allott of Colorado and Henry C. Dworshak of Idaho. A Republican debacle in 1960, involving these men, would be a body blow to the party from which it might take more than a decade to recover.

Conversely, the only states in which the Republicans have a reasonable chance to win Senatorial seats from incumbent Democrats are also located in the Midwest and Mountain States, as follows: Paul H. Douglas (Illinois); Hubert H.

Humphrey (Minnesota); Patrick V. McNamara (Michigan); James E. Murray (Montana); Joseph C. O'Mahoney (Wyoming); and Clinton P. Anderson (New Mexico). Obviously this region will be the big battleground for the Republican effort two years hence to regain ground in the US Senate.

Obviously, also, the only hope of defeating Nelson Rockefeller and nominating a candidate like Vice President Nixon depends upon a strongly unified, resurgent Republican party in the Midwest and Mountain States.

● By the same token, if the Democrats extend their control in this area it will prove virtually impossible to elect *any* Republican Presidential nominee—whether it be Nelson Rockefeller or Richard Nixon—in the year 1960. Electoral statistics show this:

There are 132 Electoral College votes in the nine Midwest states of Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, Nebraska, Ohio and Wisconsin alone, not to mention the Mountain States. There are 128 Electoral votes in the Deep South, which will be Democratic or some label of Democrat, but certainly not Republican, in 1960. The total number of Electoral votes (including Alaska's in the revised tabulation) necessary to cinch an election is 268. It seems beyond the realm of probability for the Republicans to win a Presidential election if they lose the above-mentioned Midwestern states.

● Sober facts and statistics such as these have thus prompted professionals in Washington to talk of the necessity for a new Chairman and of a reorganization of the Republican National Committee. The present Chairman, Meade Alcorn of Connecticut—whatever be his share of the responsibility for the recent November debacle—is manifestly not the man to direct the GOP fight to hold or extend the Republican bastion beyond the Appalachian mountains. Before he became National Chairman, Alcorn had little experience with Western portions of the party; he is, to say the least, provincially a Connecticut Yankee. (Despite the fact that he is a native of the Nutmeg State, the entire GOP House delegation there, and one Senator, went down to defeat this year.)

If Alcorn remains, or if someone else of the Eastern group becomes Chairman, it is felt that there will be virtually no chance for victory in the Midwest two years hence. And—so the pros figure—if the Midwest is lost, all is lost.

The problem seems to be quite clear to many on Capitol Hill and the solution equally so, if aggressive elements in the party move strongly. One of the few men (and there may be others) who have the capability of unifying, organizing and strengthening the Republican party in the Midwest is Ray Charles Bliss, presently Republican State Chairman of Ohio. Bliss, a strong supporter of Senator Taft in the contest for the 1952 GOP nomination, has held many offices in the Republican party. But, most important of all, he has been Chairman of the Midwest and Rocky Mountain Republican State Chairmen's Association since 1953. He is, therefore, the acknowledged leader of Republicanism, with a rich familiarity with the rank, file and hierarchy of the Midwest parties, in the very area where the crucial Presidential and congressional battles of 1960 will be fought.

As many GOP pros put it: "What are we waiting for?"

Crusade for an Honest Dollar: As all Western Europe—with General de Gaulle at the head of the parade—turns now towards the goal of fiscal solvency, Capital observers speculate that the transatlantic trend will show up in this country ere long, despite the November election victory for labor and the "liberals." A number of items add up to the possibility of an American crusade for an honest dollar:

● **Item 1.** President Eisenhower, after he made a 180-degree turn from "liberal" spending ideas last fall, seems to be sticking to his new phase. He still rants privately against "spending" and "radicals," and most of his public utterances and Executive moves harmonize with his newly acquired fear of inflation.

● **Item 2.** *Washington observers believe that the President's unprecedented announcement of his Budget plans, two weeks before Congress was to assemble, underlined "the new Ike" attitude. The influence of conservative Senate wheel horse Styles Bridges (R.-N.H.), who recently was closeted with Ike for several confabs, is one important factor. The public knows Bridges as a firm, unyielding conservative. But the public is perhaps not aware that Bridges' personality is quiet, soothing, persuasive—just the kind to please and sway the amiable Ike in private conferences.*

● **Item 3.** The downward trend of Budget spending estimates—from 79 to 78, then to 77 billion dollars—does not pass unnoticed. To take big hunks out of the last total is the goal of economizers—in agriculture, foreign aid and welfarism, not to mention such areas of waste as the civilian atomic energy program.

● **Item 4.** *Those who go in and out of the White House bring news that the President has been much affected by some farewell words from resigning Secretary of Commerce Sinclair Weeks. The latter reportedly told the President that he should launch a huge national crusade against inflation, and mount a big public-relations campaign to bring home his message to every American.*

● **Item 5.** At almost the same time, Senator Harry Byrd (D.-Va.) sounded a tocsin for what he called "a national crusade from the grass roots to save our repre-

sentative democracy which is founded upon the free enterprise system. Such a crusade must be inspired and led by the President." And Byrd went on to restate his long familiar demands for an honest dollar, for economy in Government and for a balanced Budget.

● **Item 6.** *Then former Secretary of the Treasury George Humphrey praised the President's stand for a balanced Budget as "one of the greatest actions of his Administration." Humphrey early in 1957 sparked the nationwide popular uprising for cuts in Governmental spending—a mass movement which, unfortunately, Ike then opposed.*

All this suggests that the "spending radicals" thronging Capitol Hill after their election victory may face some determined opposition.

Filibuster Fight: The first order of business of the Senate when it assembles this week will be a showdown over Rule 22, the Senate regulation which stipulates that debate can be closed only by a vote of two-thirds of the entire Senate. At the core of the dispute—as summarized by the impartial publication, *Congressional Digest*—is the Senate's role as a check on unrestrained majoritarianism in our system of checks and balances: "The Senate has always been accepted as the deliberative body of sober second thought, so designed to act as a brake on popular trends . . . This acceptance of the Senate's role as custodian of the 'minority' is undoubtedly the heart of the matter."

As the opposing sides form to decide this question, commentators recall instances in which the right of the minority was protected only by free Senatorial debate, and in which the impulsive majority later admitted its mistake. One such instance was the railroad strike of 1946, when President Truman asked for power to draft recalcitrant strikers. Senator James O. Eastland (D.-Miss.), in a television encounter with left-wing cartoonist Herblock of the *Washington Post*, cited this famous incident as an example of the need for free debate. One other commentator also harked back to that strike as a justification for filibusters—columnist Walter Lippmann. Lippmann, whose stand on most political issues places him in far left field, chided Senator Paul Douglas (D.-Ill.) for his filibuster stand.

"He might ponder," said Lippmann, "the case of President Truman's emergency strike legislation which proposed to break the railroad strike by drafting the railroad men into the Army. The House was stampeded into passing this bill two hours after the President's message by a vote of 306 to 13. But Senators Taft and Wagner held it up in the Senate, and after six days of debate its sponsors were compelled to omit the provisions for a draft."

One of the most effective presentations against altering the present rule on Senate discussion is a pamphlet compiled by Senator Carl Hayden (D.-Ariz.), marshaling the arguments of over a dozen Senators, during previous debates, against altering the rule providing for cloture. Hayden concludes with these words from Senator James A. Reed (D.-Mo.): "As long as we can keep this forum free, as long as a vigorous and deter-

mined minority can prevent the passage of a statute, so long this country will be safe . . . no great act of treachery can ever be consummated where there are . . . some brave souls to stand in its resistance and to stand to the end."

How to Deal With Bombings: Significant voices are being raised in defense of local police responsibility, in the growing agitation for a Federal law against bombings of schools and churches. Some advising caution on the subject are staunch defenders of strict separation of governmental powers, such as FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover, who recently said that "the present threat from bombings can be most effectively diagnosed and combatted on the local level." (Hoover similarly went on record against Federal policing of Little Rock, Arkansas, during the 1957 integration crisis there.)

Others commenting on the proposal, less consistent in their regard for the concept of local responsibility, have also questioned the wisdom of passing a Federal law to curb the dynamiters. For example, "liberal" columnist Roscoe Drummond reports the views of "high officials in Washington" (including Hoover) who believe that crime is a local responsibility, and that the effect of a Federal law on the subject would be to relax local vigilance against violations. Comments Drummond: "To divide authority tends to weaken, not strengthen law enforcement."

Another surprising dissenter from the agitation for a Federal anti-bombing law is Senator-elect Frank Moss of Utah, a left-wing Democrat. Asked if he favored such a law, Moss answered: "Of course, the immediate inclination is to say 'yes,' because it's such a heinous offense and it's so revolting. However, I'm tinged a little with caution there. I have great faith in local law enforcement and I'm not ready to just jump off every time there's something shocking or bad and transfer it over to Federal jurisdiction."

The Court and Subversion: The threat of Communist subversion continued to grow in 1958—so stated FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover in his annual report to the Attorney General. "Sensing a more favorable atmosphere," Hoover said, "the Communist party, USA, and its dupes and sympathizers gained further courage and became more vocal in their attacks upon law enforcement and other professions which are dedicated to preserving our freedoms." Students of subversion note gravely a marked relationship between this "more favorable atmosphere" for communism and the left-wing decisions of the Supreme Court.

Hoover said in his report that "since June, 1958, several [Communist] party leaders have applied for passports and made plans to travel to the Soviet Union." State Department records, as brought out in recent congressional hearings, reveal that over 700 known Communists and security risks have applied for passports in the past six months. Out of 702 applications, 642 have been approved and the remaining 60 are being processed.

Behind this flow of Communists and security risks: last June's Supreme Court ruling that the Secretary of

State may not deny passports when he believes that the applicants would operate abroad against the best interests of the United States. Among those granted passports under this dispensation have been such well-known figures as Earl Browder, one-time head of the CPUSA; Maurice Halperin, identified as a member of a Washington spy ring; Victor Perlo, identified as a Government employee who engaged in espionage; and Anna Louise Strong, a veteran leftist writer who used a passport granted in June to travel in Red China in violation of its terms.

● Hoover also took note of the fact that, in 1958, two Communist party leaders were convicted under the Smith Act, but that eleven Communists were ordered acquitted as a result of appeals filed following their convictions, and 23 others were remanded for new trials. The Hoover analysis confirms that of anti-Communists who fear that shortly there will not be a single Smith Act Communist prisoner left behind bars, thanks to the Supreme Court. At a recent parole hearing in the Capital, Communist spokesmen fought hard to secure the release of two Smith Act prisoners presently in jail, Gilbert Green and Henry Winston. Although the press was barred from the hearing, Simon Gerson, Managing Editor of the *Communist Worker*, obtained entrance by the device of showing up to plead on behalf of Green and Winston; he then sat through the entire proceedings and wrote them up for *The Worker*.

According to Gerson's report, Communist attorney John Abt pointed out "that since the Supreme Court decision in the California Smith case (the famous *Yates* decision of June 17, 1957) all Smith Act cases have been reversed or dropped." Significantly, Abt added: "Had Winston or Green been tried today, they could not have been convicted."

A Woman's View: Congresswoman Katherine St. George (R.-N.Y.), re-elected by a comfortable margin on November 4, stirred Washington recently with an exceptionally frank speech about the causes of her party's defeat—a speech which incidentally voiced the sentiments of many of her less outspoken colleagues. "The average candidate," she remarked, "has not got the means to pay a personal-relations counsel to put him or her over, to write speeches, place them with the press agents, and last, but by no means least, pay the tremendous sums necessary for television appearances. So many candidates accept aid, financial and otherwise, from well-organized pressure groups who . . . belong to the radical side, such as COPE, ADA, and others, to mention only the best-known and the most successful.

"Of course for this assistance they have to do the bidding of their sponsors, or they will be relegated to other pastures that will be far from green. On the other side, we have the American businessman, who has all the political ineptitude of a pig on ice. When he gives, he gives too little and too late. He invariably spends a lot of money at the last moment on some Republican candidate in an overwhelmingly Democratic district, preferably in the Deep South, and lets someone who might stand a fair chance, if given a little help, go it alone . . .

"If the Republican party thinks it can survive by playing politics briefly every two years and then doing

it in a most amateurish manner, they will soon find out their mistake. If the Republican party cannot furnish a positive and aggressive philosophy, they will not win and should not win. The list of enrolled Republicans that did not vote—and it is a big list—should be studied today, now, not in sorrow, but in anger at our own ineptitude. If we had offered them something to vote for they would have voted.”

Welcome to 1984: Author George Orwell, in his famous novel, *1984*, envisioned a completely collectivized world in which history was rewritten daily to suit the purposes of the ruling tyrants. Events which the powers of state found embarrassing or inconvenient were simply eradicated from historical sources.

A Washingtonian seeking information on UAW boss Walter Reuther suggests that 1984 may be closer than the calendar would indicate. This researcher, known for his care in assembling facts, attempted to find a copy of the July, 1934, issue of the *Socialist Challenge*, which contains the text of Reuther's famous letter from the Soviet Union, describing Communist life there in glowing terms. The Library of Congress, it developed, had a complete file of every issue of the *Socialist Challenge*—except the one containing this letter, extremely damaging to the left-wing boss. The New York City public library also contained every number of the *Challenge* except this single incriminating number.

(The same researcher recalls similar discoveries, by those doing background work on Soviet communism. For example, when Trotsky was vanquished in his power struggle with Stalin, library books concerning Trotsky, or sections of others that dealt with him, frequently disappeared.)

● Senator William F. Knowland, during his gubernatorial campaign, disclosed another instance of information of interest to labor bosses that has turned up missing. In his historic speech before a group of labor officials in Fresno, Calif. (see HUMAN EVENTS for April 28, 1958), Knowland said: “The late Samuel Gompers, the founder and father of the American Federation of Labor, pleaded the cause of voluntarism in unions. He also wrote in his autobiography, printed in 1925, page 132—and I might parenthetically add that this quote has been curiously omitted from the newly revised and edited edition of 1957—the following. . . ‘I held and I hold that if a union expels a member and he is deprived of a livelihood in theory or practice insofar as he and his dependents are concerned, it is capital punishment!’”

Taxes: “Liberal” spenders frequently trumpet that the bloated growth of Government expenditures is required by a corresponding growth in our so-called “exploding” population. But a recent study by the Tax Foundation, Inc., reveals that, while the population of the US has increased by about 33 per cent in the past 20 years, the cost of Government—Federal, state and local—has increased almost 600 per cent.

Churches: Clerical opinion continues to mass against the stand of a National Council of Churches study conference, which urged diplomatic recognition of Red China

(see HUMAN EVENTS for December 1 and December 22, 1958). Recently joining the angry dissent of many pastors was an important Protestant voice—that of Methodist Bishop W. Angie Smith, whose episcopal area covers Oklahoma and New Mexico. Bishop Smith wrote, in his annual Christmas message, that “these people [on the NCC committee] have a perfect right to express their personal views, but they have no right to say that position represents the mind of the church. To say the least it does not represent my position at all.

“I am definitely opposed to recognizing Red China and cannot see any reason for their admittance into the United Nations. Red China must be forced to clean up and demonstrate that they will live and act like civilized nations are expected to live.”

Orval and Adlai: Capital conservatives note some revealing changes between the 1957 and 1958 versions of the Gallup poll's list of the ten men America admires most. Advancing from seventh to sixth position this year, despite his absence from the news, was General Douglas MacArthur. Vice President Nixon, who was not among the top ten at all last year, appeared in seventh position in 1958, while former President Truman dropped from third place to fifth.

Adlai Stevenson, listed ninth in 1957, dropped out of the top ten this year. Taking his place as the only active Democratic politician on the “most admired” list: Governor Orval Faubus of Arkansas.

HERBERT J. YATES, President, Republic Productions, television and screen studios: “A friend of mine introduced me to HUMAN EVENTS and I have found the contents extremely interesting as it enlarges my knowledge of world affairs in a straightforward unbiased manner.”

BOB SIEGRIST, President, Bob Siegrist Enterprises: “As a regular HUMAN EVENTS subscriber and reader, I find it forever courageous, informative, accurate and original in its reports of that all-too-frequently ignored or misunderstood vital element known as the ‘news behind the news.’ This makes this forthright digest of conservative intelligence a ‘must.’”

F. GORDON O'NEILL, Editor, The Texas Catholic: “The advantage I have always found in HUMAN EVENTS is that it prints news very unpalatable to the publishers of HUMAN EVENTS. My publisher as of now reads HUMAN EVENTS and sends it to me, but for years before, I took it to find out what was really going on.”

PATRICK F. SCANLAN, Editor, The Tablet: “We never fail to read HUMAN EVENTS. It gives us news we see in no other place, and it offers brilliant comments on things transpiring at home and abroad.”

K. C. LONG, Chairman of the Board, Dayton Power and Light Co.: “HUMAN EVENTS covers in the News Section important items of current events in a meaty straightforward way, does not labor the point. The Article Section is really educational and is good quick reading. The headings of both sections enable you to select quickly matters of interest to you.”

CLIFTON B. WILBURN, President, Southeastern Factors Corporation: “Permit me to say that you and your staff are performing a public service extraordinary in making available to the American public your publication, HUMAN EVENTS.”

Additional copies of 4-page News Section or Article Section: single copy 20c (coins, not stamps); 10 copies \$1; 25 copies \$2; 100 copies \$5; 500 copies \$20; 1000 copies \$30. In lots of 5000 \$25 per thousand. Unless otherwise ordered, reprints are sent by fourth-class mail which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first-class mail delivery, add one cent a copy; for airmail, add two cents a copy.

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTIONS TO HUMAN EVENTS for new subscribers only: 5 weeks \$1. Yearly rate, \$11; 6 months, \$6; 3 months, \$3.

By first class mail, \$13 a year; by airmail (including APO and FPO) \$15 a year. FOREIGN: \$14 a year; airmail, Europe, Latin America, \$21 a year; airmail, Asia, Africa and Pacific, \$36 a year.

Bound Annual Volume with complete index, \$15. Only 1955, 1956, and 1957 volumes available.

For change of address send old address (exactly as it appears on the envelope of your copy of HUMAN EVENTS) and new address (with zone number if any). Allow us 2 weeks to process new subscriptions and changes of address.

The Declaration of Independence opens: “When in the course of HUMAN EVENTS . . .”

HUMAN EVENTS, 408 First St., SE, Washington 3, D. C., is a weekly Washington news-letter. Founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. Published usually in two sections: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article section. Second-class postage paid at Washington, D. C. Copyright 1959.

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, Editor and Publisher
M. STANTON EVANS, Managing Editor

JAMES L. WICK, Executive Publisher
FRANK CHODOROV, Contributing Editor

THE FIRST HURRAH

Lyndon Johnson's Program For the New Congress

By LAOCOON, JR.

AS THE STRUGGLE over the "filibuster" rule—Rule 22—marks the opening session of this Congress, many eyes will follow the motions of the Majority Leader of the Senate, Lyndon Baines Johnson. Some conservatives hope and believe that Johnson will stage a performance which—at least in its superficial aspect—will seem to moderate the more ferocious demands of the far left wing of his party. If so, it will not be the first time that he has managed to ingratiate himself with hopeful but innocent conservatives; his record, however, shows that they have suffered an unbroken series of defeats at his hands, since he assumed the role of Majority Leader in 1955.

The most obvious conservative victim of Johnson's use of his leadership is the Republican party. The disaster which overwhelmed the GOP on November 4, 1958, was not a natural phenomenon, but a man-made earthquake. Johnson, working with House Speaker Sam Rayburn, served as director of a carefully planned mining and sapping operation which brought the once strong Republicans down to ruin; he accomplished his task by deft manipulation of Congress, and of its constitutional control of the purse.

When Johnson came to power in 1954, he did so because the divided and disillusioned Republicans had refused to fight for a congressional victory. They had sulked in their tents like Achilles, because they did not like the Modern Republican influences in the White House, though Joe McCarthy told them the only power able to offset modernism in the Executive branch was conservative Republicans in the chairmanships of the great congressional committees.

Johnson operates below the surface. His fantastic talent for work paid off in national recognition as a master of legislative craftsmanship in the 1957 "civil rights" debate. Though "everybody" knew the "civil rights" bill would show clearly how the Democratic party was torn down the middle, beyond hope of mending, Johnson

piloted a strong bill through the Senate, without visible signs of party fracture. Ecstatic columnists wrote articles about his brilliant tactics in managing the Senate. The praise was deserved, but few people noticed that Johnson's "compromise" was an all-out "civil rights" bill, for which the conservative Democrats said "thank you," and the conservative Republicans said nothing.

JOHNSON HAS BEEN, throughout his career, a left-wing Democrat. He is politically a product of the late 1930's, when Franklin Roosevelt set out to build New Deal parties in each state, to undermine the conservative Democrats whom he could not browbeat. The New Deal agencies under Hopkins, Tugwell, Wallace and Nathan Witt, well-staffed with aggressive New Dealers, used their easy money for missionary work among prospective supporters of a radical party. In Texas, the Okies and Arkies, the workers in the new labor unions, the sharecroppers and minorities, were woven together into voting blocs. They became the nuclei of a left-wing Democratic party, put together right under the noses of John Nance Garner and Jesse Jones. The success of this revolutionary political movement should have been evident in 1940, when men with outstanding conservative records, like Martin Dies and Hatton Sumners, retired from Congress, and Tom Connally changed from a foremost opponent of Roosevelt's Court-packing scheme to one of the legislative architects of New Deal postwar internationalism.

Sam Rayburn is likewise a left-wing Democrat, not by ideology but by calculation. Rayburn too believes the collectivist trend is the wave of the future, and smart politicians ride the gravy train.

The left-wing bias of Johnson and Rayburn was the greater because they had so little support within Texas itself. Roosevelt's people had to build up men-on-the-make, because established leaders of the community would not go along.

The climbers could be relied on because they could not have risen without outside help. Johnson was barely elected to the Senate over Governor Coke Stevenson; his margin was exactly 87 votes—a fact which causes many Texans to refer to him scoffingly as “Landslide Lyndon.” Rayburn keeps a majority in his district by the time-honored methods of machine politics.

It is very important, in following the course of this new-style leadership of the Democratic party, to make full allowance for the way Johnson and his mentor continue to look and talk like Southern Democrats. This carefully preserved camouflage means that they can persuade the real Southern conservatives to accept long steps towards a collectivized state, without knowing what they are doing. Johnson knows the actual strength of the Southern conservatives is limited by many factors, internal and external. For one thing, the techniques Roosevelt's New Dealers used in Texas have also been successful in building a new-type “Democratic” party in other Southern states, which raised to leadership men like Sparkman, Hill, Kefauver, Gore, Pepper, Fulbright, Kerr and Governor Clement of Tennessee.

Meanwhile, the stereotype was carefully encouraged that left-wing power stems from the big cities of the North and East, while all those with a Southern accent are safe on constitutional issues.

Silliest of all, the conservatives of the North believe Johnson and Rayburn are middle-of-the-roaders, holding the radicals in line. GOP National Chairman Meade Alcorn gave Johnson his blessing as a moderate, when he should have been painting him with horns and a tail, as the arch foe of conservatism and economy.

In 1958 Johnson moved into a new role far beyond the master tactician of the “civil rights” debate of 1957. In December '57 he began actively injecting Congress into major problems of the Executive branch. The success of the Soviet sputnik, ballyhooed in the press, gave him the launching pad he wanted. Johnson set up congressional hearings on satellites and the missiles programs. These hearings were supposed to be strictly “nonpartisan” and all committee reports were unanimous. But a careful observer would have noticed how the “nonpartisan” publicity always built up Lyndon Johnson. Suddenly recession took the spotlight. Johnson shifted as quickly. Again he arranged congressional hearings. Again, the Johnson Democrats won all the plau-

aits. Senator Kerr and his fellow New Dealers used the Finance Committee to put on their show. They sought to make it appear that the Democrats were deeply concerned about the unemployed, while the cold-blooded Republicans were concerned only about business profits.

BY FEBRUARY or March of 1958 it should have been obvious that Johnson was up to something special. He was carrying out a brilliant campaign to seize the initiative from the Executive branch, in preparation for 1958 and 1960. He did not criticize Eisenhower, but the strategy was simple. Eisenhower was to look too old, too tired, too sick, to cope with missiles or the recession. The only hope of vigorous action was in the (now united) Democratic party.

It is said that one Indian never told another his stick was crooked. That would not have been polite. He merely laid a straight stick next to it. Johnson was too clever a politician to say Eisenhower was enfeebled. That would have made the President a martyr of dirty politics. Johnson merely gave dramatic expression to the image of the Democratic majority in Congress, deeply concerned about national crises, ready with their remedies, but too polite to point out the feebleness of an aging President.

That is still within the tradition for an opposition party. But it is not the whole story. The left-wing general staff had a series of spending programs which Johnson proceeded to put through the Senate—money for defense, for housing, for surplus commodities, for the Ex-Im bank, for local public works and for the depressed areas. While Government spending was being sent sky-high, the Democratic brain trust, led by Senator Kerr of Oklahoma, staged a dramatic attack on the GOP Administration program of reducing the debt and paying honest rates of interest for money borrowed from the people's savings. In chorus they demanded easy money, artificially low interest rates, more inflation and a tax cut.

These plans, all leading in the same direction and all neatly interlocked to reinforce each other, were obviously not made up on the spur of the moment. Brilliant political generalship had gone into the campaign to turn the whole economy about on its pivot and force the United States back to deficit financing. Long and careful technical work had gone into drafting the bills and dramatizing the arguments for each legislative step.

The Congress of 1958 was not confronted with a random series of spending bills, which inci-

dentally put us back into the red. It was blindly fighting against a carefully worked out grand strategy for forcing the United States Government to return to Keynesian spending, inflated money, an eroding dollar, and the gradual extinction of private savings and of middle-class independence. This was a full-scale return to the socialist planning state of the late 1930's.

Much of the technical work for this strategy, and the bills which put it into effect, was carried out by stalwarts of the old New Deal, like Leon Keyserling, who published their plans in obscure technical-sounding left-wing reports which conservatives do not read. We are told that Arthur Schlesinger, Jr. and other advisers of Adlai Stevenson are supplying the political dynamics, but the finesse of this operation indicates greater intelligence than theirs.

The Lyndon Johnson of 1958 was politically a far more dangerous man than the Lyndon Johnson of 1957. By temperament he might have remained a tactician who loves the bustle of getting things done, an expert manager of the Senatorial contingent of the national Democratic party. But last session's Lyndon Johnson had a new dimension; he became the front man in the building of a rejuvenated left-wing Democratic party, disguised as a middle-of-the-road party under Southern conservative guidance. Nothing so good as this had happened since Harry Hopkins climbed to world power, disguised as a social worker.

JOHNSON IS BUILDING a kind of left-wing party which has hardly any visible connection with the old New Deal. He is set to get rid of all the stigmata which marked the New Deal in the public mind, and to keep only the core—central control of money, the economy, public opinion, and political organization. Meanwhile, the innocents in both parties still believe Johnson represents the South. They still swallow the story that he has nothing to do with the left-wing machine which has been responsible for the popular support of the New Deal ever since Roosevelt's second term.

The first evidence of his remaking of the radical party could have been seen at the 1956 Democratic Convention. It was fairly certain that Eisenhower would be re-elected in 1956. The Democratic nomination was a forlorn hope. For this gloomy task the leading places were given to Stevenson, Kefauver, Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt and Harry Truman. Lyndon Johnson was in the background, very quiet. But if Lyndon Johnson intended building a left-wing Democratic party in conservative dress for 1960, what better could

he have done than get rid of the old party stalwarts by giving them first place in a contest with Eisenhower?

Meanwhile, Johnson is using with masterly skill all the standard instruments of mass communications—radio, television, press and direct mail—to build up a mass following, in Texas and outside, for his new-style political machine. None of the brilliant effects he achieves in public relations and publicity are the result of chance.

Does Johnson hope to be President? There is only one possible answer. Heart attack or no, it looks certain that Johnson plans to be President of a rebuilt Democratic party wielding permanently all the emergency powers of Franklin Roosevelt. Johnson and his strategists laid down a four-year plan to achieve their aims. The first step was to clean house at the last convention, next to "unite" the party in 1957, and then, in 1958, to construct the legislative underpinning for a strong Executive-dominated state with plenty of tax funds, in forms easily managed by an elite. The fourth step was the congressional campaign. After their happy run-up of spending in billions, the always sardonic New Dealers based their 1958 appeal to the voters on a nationwide blitz, blaming the high cost of living on the Republicans!

In any event, Johnson used the 1958 session of Congress as a revolutionary instrument as skillfully as Roosevelt used the Presidency in 1933. Johnson is able to manipulate the Congress as a platform of his will, for the same reason that Roosevelt was able to manipulate the Executive branch—he thoroughly understood an institution few people understand, and he knew it was laid down at critical points, while its administration thought it was still whole and sound.

In 1933, Roosevelt and his brain trust realized that the Presidency was for the moment a completely fluid thing which, in the stress of national bitterness against the depression, could be used for anything they wished. Late in 1932, Alvin Johnson of the New School for Social Research said that "six determined men could make this country over." Tugwell and others who saw the momentary breaking of political boundaries, with its opportunities for the ruthless, flocked to Franklin Roosevelt, Governor of New York and an open candidate for election to the Presidency.

The same fluidity exists today for a different reason—because the Eisenhower Administration

and the Republican party have no answer to the collectivist trend. Eisenhower's six years have provided a gentlemanly lull in the desperate battle over who is to control the economic and political power which we call the United States. But only a lull. No Darius or Xerxes, Genghis Khan or Attila the Hun ever dreamed of such wealth and power as the American people built up during their brief respite of freedom from the age-old exploitation of man by man. Roosevelt and his followers learned how to concentrate the wealth and power of the Nation under Executive branch control, but no one can yet say who will control the new Governmental colossus itself.

Johnson knows how to put the pressure on at every point in the congressional structure at which power can be concentrated—more political staff appointments in committees, more help in their home territory to Senators who behave well, more absent-minded indifference to those who do not obey. Such "help" and hindrance are not limited to Democrats. He kept the Congress in session for several extra weeks so that Knowland and other hard-pressed Republicans could not campaign.

HOW FAR JOHNSON goes in making an intellectual analysis of the contemporary political crisis does not matter. He watches his hunting-ground with the cunning of a fox, moves fast and ruthlessly wherever an opening appears, and keeps the whole operating with assembly-line speed and smoothness, to the appointed end.

The results have been dazzling. By consummate technical skill and brilliant strategic guidance, Johnson in seven months turned the Eisenhower achievement upside down without waking the Republicans up. He converted the national Budget from financial balance, debt repayment and honest money, to a deficit which runs to about a billion a month and which shows promise of going higher. Johnson turned the political climate from economy, limited Government, falling taxes and private initiative to a "newer and better" welfare state resting on unlimited spending, concentration of power, Government by an elite, and the soundless decay of free institutions.

Johnson now has absolute control of Congress for the next two years, and Congress has constitutional control of the spending power. What can we expect if the trends are extended into the coming years? The Johnson Congress in 1959 and 1960 will send deficit spending much higher. It will tighten the grip of the Federal Government

on the schools, "civil rights," community redevelopment, the armed forces. It will quietly erase the power of the Southern committee chairmen. It will set up investigating committees, like the Buchanan committee, to paint the Republicans and conservative Democrats a dirty grey and terrify timid contributors to the opposition.

Johnson's new revolutionary movement can be stopped. But it cannot be stopped by people who do not know this is a battle of ideologies, of political machines, and of mass communications. When the British armed forces were leaving Suez in 1956 after the Anglo-French attack, proud but broken, someone said: "They were right about everything but the century. It's the twentieth."

In our twentieth-century world, men have learned to achieve their ends in ways that defy the understanding of the casual beholder; to the ordinary person, it would seem incredible that Nasser's Egypt, the very model of political and military weakness in a national state, could hand a stunning diplomatic defeat to two of the world's foremost civilized nations. But this is an age in which subterranean forces do the real work, and externals count for little. In assessing the role of Lyndon Johnson, and in seeking to counteract the sweep toward collectivism, we must constantly keep in mind that twentieth-century techniques are in use. If American conservatives can meet the challenge on this level, they may yet win the political struggle from the masters of the new technology.

HUMAN EVENTS was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. It is published weekly at 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D.C. and reports from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It is usually published in two parts: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article. \$11 per year.
TRIAL SUBSCRIPTIONS, new subscribers only: 5 weeks for \$1.

ORDER BLANK

HUMAN EVENTS, 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D. C.

Send me _____ reprints of "THE FIRST HURRAH" at \$ _____.

☐ Payment enclosed

☐ Bill me

Additional copies of this 4-page article: single copy 20c (coins, not stamps); 10 copies \$1; 25 copies \$2; 100 copies \$5; 500 copies \$20; 1,000 copies \$30. In 5,000 lots \$25 per thousand. News section sold separately—at same rates. Unless otherwise ordered, reprints are sent by fourth-class mail which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first-class mail delivery, add one cent a copy, for airmail, add two cents a copy.

Enter my subscription ☐ 5 weeks for \$1 ☐ 1 year for \$11

Name _____

Street _____

City _____ Zone _____ State _____